

General Application Requirements (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700549

Agency Information

(Carefully read the instructions before completing this form)

1. Agency Information

- a. Agency Name USFS - Inyo National Forest
- b. Organizational Unit
- c. Address 351 Pacu Lane, Suite 200
- e. City Bishop State CA Zip 93514
- f. Federal Id Number 76-0873243 DUNS Number
- g. Agency fiscal year (beginning month and day) October-01
- h. Agency Type (Please check one)
- ☐ City ☐ County ☒ U.S. Forest Service
- ☐ U.S. Forest Service - Patrol District ☐ U.S. Bureau of Land Management ☐ Other Federal Agency
- ☐ Federally Recognized Native American Tribe ☐ Educational Institution ☐ Nonprofit Organization - 501(c)(3) status only
- ☐ State Agency ☐ District

2. Project Information

- a. Project Name General Application Requirements
- b. Is implementing agency same as Agency (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No
- c. Implementing Agency Name
- d. Amount of Funds Requested Project Cost

Project Request(s) Summary

#	Project Type	Project Title	Grant Request	Match	Total Project Cost
1	G09-02-05-D02	Development Mammoth Scenic Loop OHV/OSV Staging Expansion	217,000	97,000	314,000
2	G09-02-05-G01	Ground Operations and Maintenance	331,000	381,000	712,000
3	G09-02-05-G02	Ground Operations, Signing and Resource Mitigations for Travel Management	129,000	96,000	225,000
4	G09-02-05-P02	Shady Rest OSV-OHV Staging	26,000	15,000	41,000
5	G09-02-05-R01	Restoration, Upper Owens and Bishop Creek Watersheds	331,000	241,000	572,000
6	G09-02-05-R02	Restoration, Forest Projects	426,000	159,000	585,000
7	G09-02-05-R03	Restoration, Travel Management Implementation	343,000	189,000	532,000
8		TOTAL	1,803,000	1,178,000	2,981,000

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____

APP # 700549

3. Contact

a. Authorized Representative

Name	Jim Upchurch				
Title	Forest Supervisor				
Mailing Address	351 Pacu Lane, Suite 200				
City	Bishop	State	CA	Zip	93514
Telephone	(760) 873-2550			Fax	
E-mail Address	jupchurch01@fs.fed.us				

b. Project Administrator

Name	Jeff Marsolais				
Title	Forest Recreation Officer				
Mailing Address	USDA Forest Service				
City	Bishop	State	CA	Zip	93514
Telephone	(760) 873-2515			Fax	
E-mail Address	jmarsolais@fs.fed.us				

Location Map

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700549

A. Location Map

Attachments:

[Inyo National Forest Location Map](#)

Equipment Inventory

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700549

A. Equipment Inventory

Has your agency purchased any Equipment with OHV Trust Funds within the last five (5) years? (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No

#	Item Description	Make	Model	Model Year	Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) or Serial Number	Project Agreement Number
1	Snowmobile-1200 miles	Arctic Cat	M7	2006	4UF06SNW46T119368	OR-2-I-82
2	ATV	Arctic Cat	700	2007	4WF07ATV57T216808	OR-2-I-82
3	Snowmobile Trailer	Trailer	Innovative - 2 place	2008	5PDCR14199R008218	G07-02-05-L01
4	Snowmobile Trailer	Trailer	Innovative - 2 place	2008	5PDCR14129R008111	G07-02-05-L01
5	Utility Vehicle Trailer	Trailer	Great Northern - LS1260	2009	5VKBB12128S003083	GO8-02-05-G01

Habitat Management Program (HMP)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700549

PART 1 - ITEM 1. DETERMINE THE NEED FOR FULL FULL HABITAT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (HMP)

All Applicants submitting Projects involving Ground Disturbing Activities are subject to HMP requirements. The HMP must cover the combined Project Area of all proposed Projects with Ground Disturbing Activities.

Applicants able to certify that none of the proposed activities listed in the Application in areas open to legal OHV Recreation contain any risk factors to special-status species and/or sensitive habitats shall submit only HMP Part 1. Applicants who cannot certify that the proposed activities listed in the Application in areas open to legal OHV Recreation do not contain any risk factors to special-status species and/or sensitive habitats shall submit HMP Parts 1 and 2.

1. Do any of your proposed projects involve Ground Disturbing Activities? (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No
2. Can the Applicant certify that none of the proposed Projects with Ground Disturbing Activities in areas open to legal OHV Recreation contain any risk factors to special-status species and/or sensitive habitats? (If you checked 'Yes', you are done with HMP) (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

PART 2 - RISK ANALYSIS, MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND REPORTING

PART 2 - Section I. Summary of HMP Changes

Has the Applicant previously submitted a HMP Part 2 that is currently in use in the proposed Project Area? (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Table 1 - Summary of HMP Changes

Changes from Previous Year	Section Where Change Occurs
No Changes	No Changes

PART 2 - Section II - Special Status Species

Table 2 - Table of All Special-Status Species and Any Other Species of Local Concern That Were Considered for Inclusion in the HMP

Species	Listing Status	Habitat	Potential for Occurrence	Addressed by HMP? If not explain why?

PART 2 - Section III - Map(s) of Project Area

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat - Table 3

Table 3 - Data (Including Baseline Data) and Management Program for Species and/or Sensitive Habitats

Species/Habitat	Known Information	Methodology	Concerns / Risks / Uncertainties	Management Objective(s)	Management Action(s)	Success Criteria

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat - Table 4

Table 4: Summary of HMP Monitoring Program

Species/Habitat	Change Detection Methodology	Effectiveness Monitoring Methodology, Including Triggers	Identify Any Applicable Validation Monitoring (Focused Studies)

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat - Table 5

Table 5. Management Review and Response; Adaptive Management

Monitoring Methodology	How Monitoring Information Will Inform Management	How Data Will Be Analyzed	Management Response to Identified Triggers	Who Will Plan Management Response

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results - Table 6

Table 6: Previous Year's Monitoring Results

Monitoring Accomplishments	Results	Were Objectives and Success Criteria Achieved?
INF 2009 General OHV Monitoring: Routes were monitored for soil impacts and road conditions. Routes were rated as green, yellow or red for improvement priority. OHV patrol personnel travelled routes daily to assess off-road use, insure compliance and provide public education.	237 miles of primary OHV routes were monitored and rated as green, yellow or red. An additional 1500 miles of secondary OHV routes were patrolled within the 10 OHV areas. No new yellow or red rated routes were identified.	Yes.
INF 2009-2010 General OSV Monitoring: Groomed trail system was monitored for resource damage, use levels, wildlife occurrence and compliance with area closures.	All 130 miles of groomed snowmobile trail were patrolled at least twice each week. Open riding areas were patrolled weekly. No evidence of vehicle/animal collisions was detected. Grooming began on December 13, 2009 and	Yes.

	continued until April 6, 2010.	
Sage Grouse: Assessed status of all roads leading to leks in Long Valley during early March. All known leks were monitored a minimum of four times during breeding season to assess grouse population size. Population censusing was accomplished in cooperation with California Department of Fish and Game, Bureau of Land Management and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.	The winter of 2009-2010 was average in terms of total precipitation, with Mammoth Pass snow sensors recording 102% of normal on April 1. Despite the normal snowfall, OSV use in the vicinity of leks was negligible. This is likely due to the fact that the primary routes into Long Valley are periodically plowed by the County and no longer suitable for use by OSVs. Lek counts began on March 26, 2010 and continued weekly until April 15. Peak lek attendance was recorded on April 8 when a total of 469 birds were observed. This represents a 44% increase relative to counts conducted during 2009. No OHV/OSV use was detected on or near leks during the strutting season.	Yes. Monitoring was accomplished and no vehicle-related disturbance was detected at leks.
Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog: Cow Creek bridge was assessed by OHV patrol and engineering personnel. Population censusing was conducted by California Department of Fish and Game biologists.	The bridge continues to function as designed and OHV use is not occurring in Cow Creek within yellow-legged frog habitat. Forest engineers determined that the bridge may not be adequate to withstand extreme flows and that annual maintenance could be avoided by replacing the structure. Population monitoring confirmed that overall frog numbers remain extremely low after the previous year's chytrid fungus episode.	Yes. Monitoring identified a need for bridge replacement which is scheduled to occur during the summer of 2010.
Northern Goshawk: OSV patrol personnel and a Wildlife Biologist visited PACs within open riding areas during late March-early April 2010. Annual surveys of known nest territories were conducted during the summer of 2009.	Access to PACs was possible during spring 2010 visits, however the snow was melting rapidly and little OSV use was detected. No off-trail riding was detected within PACs and no OSV use was detected within core nesting areas. Summer-time monitoring indicated that territory occupancy rates were low relative to past years. This was probably an artifact of the limited availability of trained personnel to search for alternate nests within known territories.	Yes. Monitoring was accomplished and no disturbance of goshawk nesting activity was detected. Monitoring also identified a need for additional survey efforts within known territories.
Bald Eagle: Journey level biologist and OSV/OHV personnel monitored off-trail	No off-trail riding was detected within important habitat areas. No off-road travel was detected within	Yes. Monitoring was accomplished and no vehicle-related disturbance was detected within important bald eagle habitat.

riding within known eagle winter roosts along the "A" trail and within 1/4-mile of the active nest site.	1/4-mile of the known bald eagle nest. The active nest successfully fledged young for the fifth consecutive year in 2009.	
Kern Plateau milkvetch 2009: Density monitoring was conducted in 2 populations in Monache and one population within wilderness (Ramshaw Meadow).	Deer Island and Bakeoven populations in Monache showed no significant change and no off-road travel was noted. Ramshaw Meadow showed a possible decline. This latter population is within wilderness and not subject to OHV impacts. Variability was quite high so conclusions are general.	Yes.
Grey leaved violet 2009: Density monitoring conducted in 3 populations, (4 plots) in Monache.	Population density variable; no significant trend. Variability was quite high, so conclusions are general. No off road travel noted.	Yes.
Routine OHV patrol in Mono milkvetch and Mono Lake lupine population and habitat areas.	Trespass observed in several areas; list of areas provided to resource specialists.	No.
Trespass noted in White Mountains, south of Patriarch Grove	Map provided to resource specialists.	No.
Pacific Southwest Region OHV/OSV, Wildlife, and Plant Monitoring (for details on methodology, see pages 18-41 of the Monitoring Plan on file with the OHMVR Division).	In 2009, data were analyzed from Regional programmatic monitoring performed in association with the Vertebrate Assemblage Focused Study. Data were collected at randomly selected OHV Use and Non-Use Sites include: habitat condition (including forest composition and structure and ground cover); occurrence and status of wildlife & plant species (including special status plants, small mammals, landbirds, owls, accipiters, carnivores, and other vertebrates); and human use, including OHV use by type and frequency.	Data analyzed to date infer that success criteria have been achieved.
Regional Marten Focused Study (for details on methodology, see the Study plan on file with the OHMVR Division).	The final report for the focused study was published in March 2007. The results show that marten occupancy, daily activity, gender ratio, or probability of detection did not change in relation to the presence or absence of motorized routes and OHV/OSV use when the routes (plus a 50 meter buffer) did not exceed about 20 percent of a 50 square kilometer area, and traffic did not exceed an average of	Results show that success criteria have been achieved.

	one vehicle every 2 hours. The spatial and temporal frequencies of OHV/OSV were not perceived by marten as significant threats at the two study sites.	
Regional Northern Goshawk Focused Study (for details on methodology, see the Study plan on file with the OHMVR Division).	In 2009, this study focused on finalizing data collect and beginning full data analysis of OHV/OSV effects including sound levels for northern goshawk on Plumas National Forest. Data have been collected on hawk behavior and reproductive success with paired OHV use and hiker experiments. Radio-tagged dispersing juveniles and foraging adults were tracked.	Final data analysis began in 2008 and will be completed in 2010. Data analyzed to date infer that success criteria have been achieved.
Regional Vertebrate Assemblage Focused Study (for details on methodology, see the Study plan on file with the OHMVR Division).	In 2009, this study focused on full data analysis of OHV effects on the Vertebrate Assemblage, including small mammal communities, landbird communities, mammalian carnivores, accipiters, and owls, in the montane forests of the central Sierra Nevada.	Final data analysis will be completed in 2010. Data analyzed to date infer that success criteria have been achieved.
Regional Northern Spotted Owl Focused Study (for details on methodology, see the Study plan on file with the OHMVR Division).	In 2009, this study focused on full data analysis of OHV effects on northern spotted owl behavior, reproductive success, and physiology (from fecal hormone analysis) on the Shasta-Trinity and Mendocino NFs.	Final data analysis will be completed in 2010.

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results - Table 7

Table 7: Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results

Management Actions	Species/ Habitat	Date Completed or Planned - mm/dd/yyyy	Changes Needed to HMP
The Inyo National Forest completed a Travel Management Plan for the entire Forest. A final environmental impact statement (FEIS) was approved during August 2009 and Motor Vehicle Use Maps (MVUM) finalized early 2010. The FEIS	Various species/various habitats	08/17/2009	No immediate changes are identified, however with additional species/habitat data provided in the FEIS and monitoring requirements identified, the HMP could be expanded in 2011 to cover a greater geographic area.

identifies approximately 700 miles of existing level 2 roads which will not be added to the Forest's transportation system. Planning is underway to disguise or restore these roads.			
During 2009 work continued in the Monache area under Restoration Grant OR-2-1-76. Work continued on Round Mountain Stringer re-route armoring. An extension of the grant was applied for to complete armoring.	American marten, grey-leaved violet.	08/15/2010	N/A
Work was completed in the Inyo Mountains under Restoration Grant OR-2-1-81. Completed restoration work in Barrel Springs wetland area and closure of routes into designated wilderness. Monitored effectiveness of previous restoration efforts.	General forest, various species.	09/30/2009	N/A
Completed NEPA and began implementation of work in the Olancha area under grant G07-02-05-R02. Restored and disguised hill-climbs and installed wilderness closures.	General forest, various species	08/15/2011	N/A
Completed NEPA and began work in Silver Canyon (Grant G07-02-05-C03) and Wyman Canyon (Grant G07-02-05-C02). Obtained necessary permits from Army Corps of Engineers and Lahontan Water Quality Control Board. Several stream crossings were re-	Panamint alligator lizard, bighorn sheep, general forest, riparian	09/01/2011	N/A

contoured and armored to improve drainage patterns and reduce sediment input.			
Completed work under Mammoth OHV Conservation and Restoration Grant. A variety of methods were utilized to close and disguise unauthorized routes in the Shady Rest, Scenic Loop and Knolls areas. Techniques included raking tracks, placing mulch or other forest litter over access points, installation of rock and constructed barriers. A minimum of 20 routes were treated.	Northern goshawk, American marten, general forest	09/30/2010	N/A
Throughout the 10 OHV areas as well as the remainder of the Inyo NF, vehicle tracks off the identified road system were raked and documented. Routine tread maintenance and erosion control work was performed. Patrol personnel installed and replaced directional and regulatory signage and made public contacts for educational purposes and to check for spark arrestors and green stickers.	Mono milkvetch, Mono Lake lupine, Spiny-leaved milkvetch, Moresfield's cinquefoil, Mono ragwort, Arabis shockleyi, Kern Plateau milkvetch, Moonworts, July gold White Mountains horkelia, Inyo phacelia, Lemmon's milkvetch, Father Crowley's lupine, general forest/various terrestrial animal species.	10/15/2009	N/A
Through the Travel Management process a decision was made to not designate routes within 100 feet of 49 selected sensitive plant populations across the Forest; other populations will be protected through signage and barrier installation.	Mono milkvetch, Mono Lake lupine, Spiny-leaved milkvetch, Moresfield's cinquefoil, Mono ragwort, Arabis shockleyi, Kern Plateau milkvetch, Moonworts, July gold White Mountains horkelia, Inyo phacelia, Lemmon's milkvetch, Father Crowley's lupine.	09/30/2012	N/A

The Forest has hired a crew of biological technicians to conduct survey work at various locations within the 10 OHV use areas. This will facilitate implementation of monitoring for the HMP.	Northern goshawk, sage grouse, willow flycatcher	09/30/2010	May need to update HMP if new populations are discovered.
---	--	------------	---

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results - Table 8

Table 8 Management Actions Taken in Response to HMP-related Public Concerns

Concern Raised by Public	Actions Taken to Address the Concern
Numerous concerns were raised during the Travel Management processs, including impacts of routes to special status plants and animals and impacts of potential route closure on public access.	Thorough analysis in Travel Management FEIS resulted in selected route closures to improve resource conditions and mitigations, rather than closure, of routes with identified access concerns.

Soil Conservation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700549

A. Soil Conservation

- a. Do any of your proposed projects involve Ground Disturbing Activities? (Please select ☒ Yes ☐ No Yes or No)

B. Soil Conservation Plan

Attachments:

[Soil_con_plan](#)

Public Review Process

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700549

A. Public Notification Efforts

Check all that apply: (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Notice to interested Parties/Groups (Enter date in mm/dd/yyyy format) [03/02/2010]
- ☒ Published on Applicant's Website (Enter date in mm/dd/yyyy format) [03/02/2010]
- ☒ Published in Newspaper
- ☒ News Release Issued
- ☒ Public Meeting(s) Hearing(s) Held

B. Public Comments

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

A total of 13 comment letters were submitted on the Inyo preliminary requests.

One letter supported all restoration work.

Two letters supported the development grants, with one asking the Forest to consider OHV needs as part of the Shady Rest OSV project. Two were generally against Forest Service receiving state funds.

Five form letters were received in general opposition to any Restoration work implementing the Travel Management FEIS/ROD, with (erroneous) statements regarding the scope and authority of the decision. There was confusion about the past MOI for Travel Management route inventory and the FEIS. Questions were raised about how potential other (non-motorized) uses of the routes would be affected. Some comments stated that additional analysis would be needed for any actions "closing roads".

Response: Some of these points were clarified in the descriptions of the projects. Full restoration of routes will not occur under this project; just disguising of entrances to routes not open to motor vehicles. Non-motorized uses will still have access to these areas. Additional analysis and/or NEPA would be required for more intensive activities, and this analysis is part of some of the Restoration requests.

One letter expressed concern about inconsistencies in use figures reported in the grants, as compared to those in TM FEIS.

Response: The numbers relate to two different questions. Use figures submitted for the grants reflect total motorized use of routes available to OHVs. The conflicting number refers to a survey question about visitors whose "primary activity" on the forest is for OHV use.

Comments were received about the Forest's large dollar request, and some concerns about high cost.

OHMVR DIVISION COMMENTS

Maps with difficulty levels:

Response: Past maps produced for summer and winter riding opportunities showed difficulty levels, but most recent maps do not. This was changed in ap. Educational presentations are made at Mammoth Motocross events and prior to OHV group work projects.

Development, Shady Rest Staging Area:

Division staff expressed that Shady Rest Staging Area is more in Planning phase. It is now submitted as a Planning grant.

The division also expressed concern about the relation of contract costs to the project, cost items, and some responses in the evaluation area. These have been addressed in the planning submittal.

Development, Mammoth Scenic Loop:

Division recommended some changes in cost estimates. The Public Input narrative needed clarification. These have been addressed.

Ground Operations and Maintenance:

Some descriptions gave impression that restoration work would occur in this work.

The description has been adjusted to better reflect the intent of the work.

Concerns about costs related to staff, vehicle expenses on grant-purchased vehicles, road maintenance equipment costs, purchase of 4wd Quad equipment.

Costs were reviewed and clarified in the "notes" area for each concern item. Vehicle charges are not for grant-purchased vehicles. Vehicle use and monthly rate (FOR) expenses are only expressed as matches, and will not be funded by the state.

Ground Operations, Signing and Resource Mitigations for Travel Management:

Concerns about costs related to staff, vehicle expenses on grant-purchased vehicles.

Response: Some staff costs were reduced after review. Clarifications on cost estimates were addressed in the "notes" area. Vehicle charges are not for grant-purchased vehicles. Charges for USFS vehicles are assessed on both a monthly rate (FOR), and a mileage rate, so the match is expressed in this way.

Restoration Upper Owens and Bishop Creek Watersheds:

Concerns about potential duplication of staff time across multiple projects, funds spent on state-purchased vehicles, excessive costs for purchases of equipment, and matching costs not directly related to the project.

These points are addressed in the current requests. In this and other grant requests, staff are funded for the needs of the specific grant. Staffing for many positions includes multiple actual personnel -- including hiring additional staff if needed. Only USFS vehicles are claimed as matching expenditures.

Restoration, Forest Projects:

Division expressed concerns about potential duplication of staff time and vehicle costs across multiple projects.

These points were clarified or addressed in the current requests. In this and other grant requests, the staff are funded for the needs of the specific grant, since there is no assurance that more than one grant would be funded; also, staffing for many positions includes multiple actual personnel -- including hiring additional staff if needed. Same is true of USFS vehicles.

C. Application Development as a result of Public Comments

- a. Were changes made to the Application as a result of public comments? (Please select ☒ Yes ☐ No Yes or No)

- b. Describe how public comments affected the Application

Most comments from the public and from the OHMVR division were addressed through minor modifications and clarification in the final descriptions and in the "notes" boxes. Many of these are summarized in Section B of Public Input. Notable changes:

Shady Rest Staging Area Development Grant is now submitted as a Planning grant.

Shady Rest Staging Area now proposes consideration for OHV considerations as well as OSV opportunities.

Various costs in staffing, equipment, and vehicles were adjusted (generally downward) based on public and division recommendations. (Example: found less-expensive GPS units that could still meet minimum project needs.)

Additional analysis found that fewer miles of roads in the Mammoth Creek watershed will need restoration activities. (The miles are reduced to 20 miles, and costs for staff and equipment use adjusted accordingly.)

Reduction in equipment match on G.O. and Maint project, based on assessment of available USFS 2011 allocation.

Other slight changes, not able to enter.

Certifications

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700549

1. Applicant Certifications

A. General Conditions

- A. The Applicant hereby certifies, under the penalty of perjury, compliance with the following terms and conditions: ☒
1. If the Project involves a Ground Disturbing Activity, the Applicant agrees to monitor the condition of soils and wildlife in the Project Area each year in order to determine whether the soil conservation standard adopted pursuant to Public Resource Code (PRC), Section 5090.35 and the HMP prepared pursuant to Section 5090.53(a) are being met.
 2. If the Project involves a Ground Disturbing Activity, the Applicant agrees that, whenever the soil conservation standard adopted pursuant to PRC Section 5090.35 is not being met in any portion of a Project Area, the recipient shall close temporarily that noncompliant portion, to repair and prevent accelerated erosion, until the same soil conservation standard adopted pursuant to PRC Section 5090.35 is met.
 3. If the Project involves a Ground Disturbing Activity, the Applicant agrees that, whenever the HMP prepared pursuant to PRC Section 5090.53(a) is not being met in any portion of a Project Area, the recipient shall close temporarily that noncompliant portion until the same HMP prepared pursuant to PRC Section 5090.53(a) is met.
 4. The Applicant agrees to enforce the registration of off-highway motor vehicles and the other provisions of Division 16.5 (commencing with Section 38000) of the Vehicle Code and to enforce the other applicable laws regarding the operation of off-highway motor vehicles.
 5. The Applicant agrees to cooperate with appropriate law enforcement entities to provide proper law enforcement at and around the Facility.
 6. The Applicant's Project is in accordance with local or federal plans and the strategic plan for OHV Recreation prepared by the OHMVR Division.

B. Programmatic Conditions

B. The Applicant must describe the following programmatic conditions:

1. Identify the potential for the facility to reduce illegal and unauthorized OHV Recreation activities in the surrounding areas:

The Inyo National Forest provides year around OHV recreation opportunities, and management of a sustainable OHV program is an essential part of the program of work for Forest Service staff. The continued presence on the ground to perform trail maintenance activities, improve directional signing, and enforce regulations results in a reduction of illegal and unauthorized OHV recreation activities in the surrounding areas by maintaining and enhancing the OHV opportunities on the Inyo NF. A more integrated approach to managing OHV recreation has resulted in improved resource conditions, and has led to a more sustainable OHV program that should continue to provide OHV recreation opportunities on public lands. This grant application includes implementation of the recently signed Travel Management FEIS as well as improved efforts at signing and visitor information through maps as part of the Forest's effort to ensure facilities meet the needs of recreating public while protecting the resources.
2. Describe how the Applicant is meeting the operations and maintenance needs of any existing OHV Recreation Facility under its jurisdiction:

The OHV recreation facilities that are managed by the Inyo National Forest include, roads and trails, and developed campgrounds. Routine road and trail maintenance and the developed campground operations and maintenance are performed by seasonal employees and volunteers. Maintenance of roads and trails and campground facilities that are more than routine in nature are performed through the Forest's Engineering program, which maintains facilities to meet federal standards. In addition to State funded grants, the Forest utilizes funding from special use permit authorities, allocated funding, cooperative agreements, and volunteers to manage OHV recreation facilities under its jurisdiction.

C. Fee Collection

Describe how fees collected pursuant to Section 38230 of the Vehicle Code (in-lieu funds) are utilized and whether the fees complement the Applicant's proposed Project:

D. Compliance with PRC 5090.50(b)(1)(C)

Projects within the O&M category that affect lands identified as inventoried roadless areas by the U.S. Forest Service, are compliant with PRC 5090.50(b)(1)(C). (Please select Yes or No)

☒ Yes ☐ No

2. Governing Body Resolution

Certification - Non Profits / Education

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700549

- 1. Written Agreement with Land Manager**
- 2. Verification of Nonprofit 501(c)(3) Status**

Evaluation Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700549

1. OHV Visitor Opportunity Summary

1 OHV Visitor Opportunity Summary

- a. Does the land manager agency provide legal OHV riding opportunity? (Please select ☒ Yes ☐ No Yes or No)

Starting (Month/Year) 10/2005

Ending (Month/Year) 09/2006

- b. Off-Highway Vehicle Opportunity Ratio (OHV Ratio) opportunity

- i. Months of OHV Opportunity (OHV Months) 12

- ii. Total Miles Of Routes Available For OHV Recreation 2216

- iii. Total Acres Of Open Riding Available For OHV Recreation 1105

- iv. OHV Visitation (visitor days) 627470

- v. Ratio of OHV Visitation/OHV Opportunity 188.94

1 OHV Visitor Opportunity Summary (2)

- c. Reference Document that support the responses to a. and b. on previous page
2006 National Visitor Use Monitoring results. (Combination of activities, questions on use of facilities which can be directly attributed to OHV use.)
- d. Visitor Opportunity Ratio (V/O Ratio) = OHV Ratio x OHV Months / 12 188.94
Visitor Opportunity Ratio (V/O Ratio) Score

2. Quality of OHV Opportunity

Land Manager's OHV program 8

Check all that apply (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Map with OHV Recreation opportunities clearly shown is available for distribution at no cost (2 points)
- ☒ Map with OHV Recreation opportunities clearly shown is available on the Land Manager's website (2 points)
- ☐ Map indicates relative difficulty of each OHV trail (2 points)
- ☒ Map indicates appropriate OHV use type (ATV, dirt bike, 4x4, OSV, etc.) (2 points)
- ☒ At least fifty percent of the staging areas include support facilities (restrooms, picnic tables, trash cans, shade structures) (2 points)
- ☐ Majority of trail intersections are signed with information such as: trail names, directional signs, relative difficulty, mileage to next feature (2 points)

3. Variety of OHV Opportunity

- a. Skill levels (e.g., beginner, intermediate, advanced) indicated by publicly available maps or signage marking trails with relative difficulty 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 3 or more skill levels (5 points)
- ☐ 2 skill levels (3 points)
- ☐ 1 skill level (1 point)
- ☐ Land Manager has no legal OHV riding opportunity (No points)

b. Type of OHV Opportunity (ATV, dirt bike, 4x4, OSV, RUV, Sand Rail/Dune Buggy) 6

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Opportunities for 3 or more vehicle types (6 points) ☐ Opportunities for 2 vehicle types (3 points)
☐ Opportunity for only 1 vehicle type (1 point) ☐ Land Manager has no legal OHV riding opportunity (No points)

4. Agency Contribution

Is the cost of OHV Program for Land Manager's most recent complete fiscal year (not to include Indirect Costs) greater than \$0?. If NO, then No points. Go to item #5. (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If YES, enter cost of OHV Program for Land Manager's most recent complete fiscal year (not to include Indirect Costs): 1671500

% Funded by OHV Trust Fund (do not include in-lieu funds): 1

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No OHV Trust Funds were used (6 points)
☐ 10% or less of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (4 points)
☐ 11% to 25% of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (3 points)
☒ 26% to 50% of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (1 point)
☐ More than 50% of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (No points)

Reference Document

FY09 PWP analysis of OHV costs.

5. Project Performance

For Applicant's OHV grant Projects which reached the end of the Project performance period within the last two years, the percentage of all deliverables accomplished 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 100% of Deliverable accomplished (5 points)
☐ 75% to 99% of Deliverables accomplished (3 points)
☐ Less than 75% of Deliverables accomplished (No points)
☐ First time Applicants and past Applicants with no active Grant projects within the last two years (2 points)

6. Previous Year Performance

In the previous year the Applicant has been responsive and communicated effectively with the assigned OHMVR Grant Administrator by phone, email or personal visit.

FOR DIVISION USE ONLY (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ In the previous year the Applicant has been responsive and communicated effectively with the assigned OHMVR Grant Administrator by phone, email or personal visit (3 points)
☐ First time Applicants and past Applicants with no active Grant projects within the last two years (2 points)
☐ In the previous year the Applicant has not been responsive (No points)

7. Prevention of OHV trespass

7. Prevention of OHV trespass - Fence (Page 1)

- a. Is site a completely fenced facility such that OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas is prevented? 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ No (answer items b and c) ☐ Yes (10 points, explain and then skip to item 8)

Explain 'Yes' response:

7. Prevention of OHV trespass - Patrol (Page 2)

- b. The majority of OHV Opportunity areas are patrolled (Check the one most appropriate) 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ At least 5 days per week (5 points)
☐ At least once per week (3 points)
☐ At least once per month (1 point)
☐ Less than once per month (No points)

Explain patrol efforts (e.g., frequency of patrol, patrol personnel, percent of lands covered by patrols)

Throughout the front country of the Inyo National Forest, Law Enforcement Officers (LEO), Forest Protection Officers (FPO), and Recreation Technicians patrol developed and dispersed areas and make public contacts, and provide information about OHV opportunities, public safety, protection of resources, and OHV enforcement. The Forest has 5 LEOs (one per Ranger District and one in the Supervisors Office), with coverage 7 days per week (year around). The North Zone (Mammoth and Mono Lake Ranger Districts) has at least 3 FPOs/Recreation Technicians patrolling during the spring/summer/fall months and 1 FPO/Recreation Technicians during the winter months as part of the OSV program. The South Zone (White Mountain and Mount Whitney Ranger Districts) has 2 FPOs/Recreation Technicians that patrol during the spring/summer/fall months, and 1 FPO that patrols during the winter months (year around OHV program). The OHV/OSV opportunity areas are patrolled at least 5 days per week throughout the year.

7. Prevention of OHV trespass - Measures (Page 3)

- c. Measures to prevent OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas 5

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Barriers and/or signing are used to prevent OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas (3 points)
☒ Education programs, maps and/or brochures provided to the public address OHV trespass, including respect for private property (2 points)

Explain measures utilized to prevent OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas

Resource protection has been a key component of the Inyo National Forest's OHV/OSV programs. Personnel are actively monitoring areas of concern, and take action where issues such as route proliferation and trespass into closed areas are beginning to occur. Public education, installation and maintenance of signage, raking out tracks, and enforcement are a major part of the duties performed by the OHV/OSV patrols. In addition, the Inyo National Forest has an active conservation and restoration program. Where resource issues have been identified that are larger in scope and scale than routine maintenance activities, numerous conservation and restoration projects (planning and implementation) have been completed to address these issues. These projects include obliterating closed routes, installing barriers, and signage. Specific attention is paid to private lands, and the Forest has been actively working with LA Department of Water and Power on routes where much of the illegal OHV activity originates.

8. OHV Education

8 OHV Education - Page 1

- a. Education materials available onsite 10

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Free literature is provided to visitors describing safe and responsible OHV recreational practices (5 points)
- ☒ Bulletin boards, signs or kiosks, at the majority of staging areas, trailheads, or other areas where the public gathers provide information concerning safe and responsible OHV Recreation (5 points)

- b. Applicant or Land Manager provides formal programs, educational talks, school field trips, etc. to the public to educate them on safe and responsible OHV recreational practices: 1

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 50 or more per year (3 points)
- ☐ 20 to 49 times per year (2 points)
- ☒ 5 to 19 times per year (1 point)
- ☐ Less than 5 times per year (No points)

8. OHV Education - Page 2

- c. When Facility is open, staff are available at trailheads, visitor centers and/or entrance stations to provide information on safe and responsible OHV use 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Daily (5 points)
- ☐ On all weekends (4 points)
- ☐ On the majority of weekends (2 points)
- ☐ On major holidays (1 points)
- ☐ None of the above (No points)

- d. ATV Safety Institute and/or Motorcycle Safety Foundation approved training courses are provided to the public: 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ At least 30 times per year (5 points)
- ☐ 18-29 times per year (3 points)
- ☐ 4-17 times per year (1 points)
- ☒ Less than 4 times per year (No points)

Describe Land Manager's onsite education efforts relative to items a. - d.:

The Forest provides information and education about safe and responsible OHV use through patrols and formal programs presented to volunteer work groups, interagency visitor centers, and partnerships with local agencies and organizations. The Forest has 4 interagency visitor centers located at major entry points which disseminate information about OHV opportunities and safe and responsible OHV use. Staff is trained and available 7 days per week during most of the year at each of the visitor centers to answer questions and disseminate information. Free maps and brochures are available, such as "Motor Touring the Eastern Sierra" (cooperative effort with multiple agencies/organizations), OSV opportunity map (cooperative effort with the Town of Mammoth Lakes), and the Forest motorized vehicle use maps. Books and maps are also available for purchase. Education is emphasized through volunteer projects (avg. 100 hrs/month), and during organized OHV events (10+/year) and permitted operations.

9. Website

- a. OHV outreach efforts are accomplished through the Land Manager's website 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (skip to question 10)
- ☒ Yes (provide URL address and answer item b)

Provide URL address www.fs.fed.us/r5/inyo

- b. The Land Manager's website contains the following items 5

(Check all that apply) - Scoring: 1 point each up to a maximum of 5 points. (Please select applicable values)

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Map to location | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hours of operation | <input type="checkbox"/> Safety information |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visitor facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contact information | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> News releases |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Information on responsible riding | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Map of Facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Fee schedule |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Seasonal restrictions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Link to Division Website | <input type="checkbox"/> Law enforcement contact information |

10. OHV Outreach

Check all forms of OHV outreach the Applicant utilizes: 3

Scoring: 1 point each up to a maximum of 3 points. (Please select applicable values)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Billboards | <input type="checkbox"/> CDs and/or DVDs |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community meetings | <input type="checkbox"/> OHV dealers |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fairs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> News releases |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) [motocross events] | <input type="checkbox"/> Television |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parades | <input type="checkbox"/> Radio |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Programs at schools | |

11. Natural and Cultural Resources

11. Natural and Cultural Resources - Page 1

- a. Is the Land Manager's OHV area a completely fenced track facility with little or no native vegetation?
0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ No (answer item b) ☐ Yes (5 points, explain and then skip to item 12)

Explain 'Yes' response

11. Natural and Cultural Resources - Page 2

- b. Resource Management Information System 5

Does the Land Manager maintain a management information system managed by qualified environmental staff that identifies and monitors the impacts of the OHV activity and contains at least the following:

- Ongoing survey/inventory of species
- Ongoing survey/inventory of archeological sites
- Biological monitoring that measures changes in populations
- Components that evaluate the effects of OHV recreation and related activity on the species;
- Recommendations for improvement in species management
- Strategies to respond to changing conditions that affect the survival or reproduction of species? (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (5 points)

Reference Document

Wildlife Habitat Protection Program (WHPP)/Habitat Management Program (HMP) for the 10 OHV/OSV Use Areas (dated September 11, 2007); Travel Management Final EIS and ROD, Biological Assessment/Evaluation for plants and wildlife, and Heritage Resource Report; wildlife, plant, and heritage survey records; and Forest GIS database that contains plant and wildlife species occurrence information, and documented heritage resource sites.

12. Soil Management

12. Soil Management - Page 1

- a. Land Manager has developed a systematic methodology for evaluating soil conditions of its OHV Opportunities? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response OHV patrols use Soil Condition Evaluation Forms to note any soil condition deviations from Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Standards. Most field going personnel have been trained in monitoring protocols.

- b. Land Manager has developed methods to address soil issues? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response Through ongoing monitoring efforts, the Forest has proactively identified and addressed soil issues through implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs), regular maintenance, and implementation of conservation and restoration projects. Examples of regular maintenance includes re-grading roads, cleaning culverts, and constructing and improving water bars. Examples of conservation and restoration projects include selective route closure (blocking and restoring to natural conditions), barrier enhancement and signage, and improving stream crossings (bridge placement and hardening the crossing through rock placement). In addition, maintenance and installation of signage, raking out tracks, and enforcement are part of the routine duties of the FPO/Recreation Technician patrols.

12. Soil Management - Page 2

- c. Land Manager performs soil monitoring 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ Monthly (3 points)

☐ After major rain events (2 points)

☐ Annually (No points)

13. Sound Level Testing

The Applicant or Land Manager conducts, or causes to be conducted, sound level testing 2

(Check only one if applicable) (Please select one from list)

☐ On most (50% or more) holidays and weekends (4 points)

☒ At least 25% but less than 50% of holidays and weekends (2 points)

☐ Less than 25% of holidays and weekends (No points)

Describe the sound testing program

Random spot checks are conducted throughout the Forest and at organized or permitted events. The Forest has sound testing equipment and certified sound testers.